

REMARKS

Claims 26, 27, 29, 30 and 34-49 were pending in the application following the last entered amendment (filed December 8, 2009). Claims 26, 27, 29 and 34 are independent claims. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as set forth herein are not obvious in view of the prior art upon which the Examiner relies. The claims as presented are allowable and reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONSRejections Under 35 USC § 103

The Examiner rejected previously-pending claims 26-27, 29-30 and 34-49 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Billington et al** (US 6,390,269) in view of **Gerlier** (US 5,076,441), and further in view of **Daout et al** (US 2004/0093117).

As an initial matter, Applicants note that **Daout et al** is not prior art to the subject application. Although filed May 5, 2004, the present application is a divisional of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/722,856 filed November 27, 2000, and is accordingly entitled to a priority of November 27, 2000 with respect to the subject matter disclosed. **Daout et al** is a U.S. Patent Application Publication that is entitled under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)(1) to the March 15, 2001 filing date of PCT Application Serial No. PCT/IB01/00488 (WO 2001/069545) – that is, “an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) . . . [that] designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language”. **Daout et al** is not entitled under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) to the March 16, 2000 filing date of Great Britain Patent Application Serial No. 0006407.1. MPEP § 2136.03(I), p. 2100-93 (8th ed. rev. 8 July 2010), citing *In re Hilmer*, 359 F.2d 859 (CCPA 1966). Accordingly, **Daout et al** has a priority date later than that of the subject application and is not prior art to the subject application.

Claim 26 recites that the note acceptor-dispenser validator receives a dispense change instruction from a host processor and, based upon that dispense change instruction, determines how the dispensing of notes by the note acceptor-dispenser and coins by a coin dispenser can be combined to dispense the appropriate amount of change as a combination of notes and coins. Similarly claim 27 recites that the note acceptor-dispenser validator system is electrically connected to the host processor to accept a dispense change instruction from the host processor

and, based upon the dispense change instruction, to determine how the dispensing of notes by the note acceptor-dispenser and coins by the coin dispenser can be combined to dispense the appropriate amount of change as a combination of notes and coins. Claim 29 and 34 each recite that the note acceptor-dispenser validator system is configured to accept a dispense change instruction from a host processor and, based upon the dispense change instruction, determine how the dispensing of notes by the note acceptor-dispenser and coins by the coin dispenser can be combined to dispense the appropriate amount of change as a combination of notes and coins. Such a feature is not found in the cited references, taken alone or in combination. The cited portion of **Billington et al** merely teaches dispensing change as any of coins, bills or electronic funds:

A customer may initiate a transaction by depositing coins or bills of particular denominations in the slots 50 or 60, respectively. The customer may also insert an electronic purse device, or a debit or credit card in the card acceptor 70 to initiate a transaction. Once sufficient payment has been deposited in the automatic transaction system 1, the customer may select a product 10 to be dispensed using the keypad 90. The corresponding product delivery apparatus 20 will then dispense the selected product 10 to the product delivery area 30 where it may be retrieved by the customer. Any resulting change from the transaction may be paid out through a coin return 80, the bill pay out recess 85 or credited to an inserted electronic purse device.

The cited portion of **Billington et al** does not teach that a bill recycler (“note acceptor-dispenser”) determines what combination of notes and coins should be dispensed as change, and in fact does not disclose either the manner (coins only, bills only, or both coins and bills) in which change is dispensed or what specific portion of the system disclosed determines the manner in which change is dispensed. **Gerlier** relates to accepting and dispensing bills in a device 1 described generally as being used for an automated teller machine (ATM), with a bare suggestion that the device 1 might be used to accept payment for a service and that device 1 include a coin delivery mechanism 18 delivering part of the calculated change (col. 5, lines 61-68). However, **Gerlier** does not disclose where or how change to be returned is calculated, and in particular does not teach that an amount of change to be dispensed is calculated by a processor outside the bill recycler (device 1), while a specific combination of bills and coins totaling that amount to be dispensed is determined by the bill recycler, as recited in the claims.

Claim 26 further recites a note hopper/change dispenser for receiving and storing up to a selected number of notes of a pre-selected denomination which are accepted by the note

validator, the note hopper/change dispenser storing at least one note of the pre-selected denomination accepted in the first transaction for dispensing as change in a subsequent transaction. Such a feature is not found in the cited references, taken alone or in combination. The cited portion of **Billington et al** merely teaches storing “acceptable” bills in the bill escrow and pay out unit 115. The cited portion of **Billington et al** does not teach bills are routed to the bill escrow and pay out unit 115 rather than the bill stacker 105 based upon denomination of the validated bill. **Gerlier** teaches an embodiment of a device 1 using two tills 9, 10 coupled together and employed identically to store a banknote stockpile, which “can deliver banknotes of predetermined denomination from the most convenient till, or can restack the banknotes between the two tills” (col. 2, lines 26-20). Banknotes accepted in **Gerlier** are all routed to one till 9 (col. 5, lines 47-51). **Gerlier** does not teach routing only bills of a predetermined denomination into one of till 9 or till 10, and all other denominations into the other till. Instead, when a banknote is to be dispensed, the denomination of the top banknote from either till 9 or 10 is checked, and that bill is dispensed if it has the correct denomination but stored in the other till if it does not have the correct denomination (col. 6, lines 1-55). **Gerlier** thus does not teach receiving and storing notes of a pre-selected denomination which are accepted by said note validator in a note hopper/change dispenser storing at least one note of the pre-selected denomination accepted in the first transaction for dispensing as change in a subsequent transaction, as recited in claim 26.

Similar to claim 26, claim 27 recites that a note hopper/change dispenser temporarily holds pre-selected characteristic notes received by the note validator, while a note box holds at least notes other than pre-selected characteristic notes. Similarly, claims 29 and 34 each recite that a note hopper (or, equivalently, a “note hopper/change dispenser”) receives and stores at least some pre-selected characteristic notes validated by the note validator or validator processor while a note box receives and holds at least notes other than pre-selected characteristic notes that are validated by the note validator or validator processor, and specifically recite that the transportation unit directs validated notes to one of the note box and the note hopper depending upon whether the validated notes are pre-selected characteristic note. Such a feature is not found in the cited references, taken alone or in combination. The cited portion of **Billington et al** merely teaches storing “acceptable” (i.e., validated) bills in the bill escrow and pay out unit 115, and does not teach either routing “acceptable” bills to the bill escrow and pay out unit 115 and “unacceptable” bills to the bill stacker 105 or routing some “acceptable” bills to the bill escrow

and pay out unit 115 rather than to the bill stacker 105 based on pre-selected characteristics (e.g., denomination and/or condition) and routing at least bills not having such pre-selected characteristics to the bill stacker 105. **Gerlier** teaches storing all accepted banknotes in a single one of two tills 9, 10, and restacking banknotes between the two tills while seeking an appropriate denomination banknote during subsequent delivery.

Claim 27 also recites that up to a selected number of notes is stored in the note hopper. Once the maximum number is met, notes – even pre-selected characteristic notes – are directed to the note box. Such a feature is not found in the cited reference.

Claims 26, 27, 39 and 34 further recite that the note acceptor-dispenser validator system determines the combination of notes and coins that is dispensed as changed. Such a feature is not found in the cited references. Although the Office Action infers the existence of such a feature in **Billington et al**, in fact **Billington et al** teaches at column 6, line 60 to column 7, line 28 that (coin) changer 110 accumulates credit for currency inserted into any bill validator or similar device connected to changer 110, and that microcontroller 400 within changer 110 determines what combination of currency is dispensed as change. Accordingly, the recited claim feature is not inherent to **Billington et al** as asserted in the Office Action. **Gerlier** does not teach that the combination of bills and coins dispensed as change is calculated within device 1.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request that the application be reconsidered and allowed, and that an early indication thereof be provided.

Please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 07-1896.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 22, 2011

/David B. Abel/

David B. Abel Reg. No. 32,394

DLA Piper LLP (US)

1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 400

Los Angeles, California 90067-6023

Tel: (310) 595-3062

Fax: (310) 595-3362